

ARGUMENTS / REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-18 and 26-30 were previously pending in this application. With the present amendment, Claims 1, 27 and 29 are amended and new Claims 31-32 are added.

Interview with Examiner

On December 22, 2010 (of even date herewith) the undersigned had a phone conversation with the Examiner in which the substance of the instant amendment to the claims were briefly discussed. The Examiner viewed the substance of the amendment favorably and suggested that if, upon reviewing the amendment, the Examiner's determines remaining issues based on the art of record, the Examiner would be inclined to allow the Applicant to submit a supplemental amendment to resolve those issues before issuing any further Office Action.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the interview and respectfully requests the Examiner to notify the undersigned before reissuing any rejections based on the art of record.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected Claims 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,051,118 to Collison ("Collison). The Examiner further rejected claims 1-18 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collison in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,804,818 to Codella ("Codella").

For the reasons already set forth on record in response to prior Office Actions, Applicant does not believe that the pending claims are unpatentable over the teachings of Collison and Codella, taken together or separately.

In addition, the independent claims 1, 27 and 29 are currently amended to further reflect limitations not taught or suggested by either Collison or Codella, taken together or separately. More specifically, neither Collison nor Codella teach the limitation: *in response to said publishing said request on the first publish/subscribe topic: sending the message to the*

second distributed application component, as set forth in claim 1 or similar limitations as set forth in the other independent claims.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner maintains that browser 11 and server 204 of Figure 3 in Collison, are analogous to a first and second distributed application component, respectively. (Office Action p. 2)

Collison, however, does not teach that server 204 receives the message that identifies server 204 in response to the message being published. Collison teachings are in fact diametric to the claimed invention. In Collison, server 204 publishes the message in response to directly receiving the message from browser 11. Thus, it would be counterintuitive, and contrary to the teachings of Collison, to modify Collison and/or combine with other teachings in the art, such as Codella, to arrive at the claimed invention, whereby the second distributed application component receives the message in response to the message being published on a publish/subscribe topic.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the claim rejections and allow the application to issue.

CONCLUSION

In view of the present amendment to the claims and the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn and a notice of allowance be issued for the present application.

In the event the Examiner believes an interview would be helpful in advancing the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number indicated below.

Dated: December 22, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

INCEPTIA LLC (Assignee) *

Tel.: (718) 928-2213

By: /Benzion A. Wachsman/

Name: Benzion A. Wachsman

Title: General Manager

* A statement under 37 C.F.R. § 3.73(b) is attached